101ST CONGRESS
1st Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
101-34

INTERJURISDICTIONAL FISHERIES ACT AUTHORIZATIONS

APRIL 25, 1989.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1225]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1225) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF APPORTIONMENT LIMITATION.

Section 304(c)(3)(B) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 4103(c)(3)(B)), hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Act", is amended by inserting "which are managed under an interstate fishery management plan" after "fishery resources".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL SHARE OF ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT WITH ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 308(b) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4107(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with an amount appropriated under the authority of this subsection shall be 75 percent of the cost of that activity.".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 308 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4107) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989." and inserting "the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992.";

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "fiscal years 1988 and 1989," and inserting "the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992,"; and

(3) in subsection (c) by striking "fiscal years 1988 and 1989" and inserting "the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992".

29-006

H563-4

Amend the title of the bill so as to read:

A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992, and for other purposes.

Purpose of the Bill

H.R. 1225 authorizes appropriations to carry out the provisions of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 for fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992. Funding is authorized at the existing levels of $5,000,000 to carry out the general provisions of the legislation; $2,500,000 for fishery disaster relief; and $350,000 to support interstate fisheries commissions.

Background and Need for Legislation

In 1986, the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act (IFA) was enacted to promote and encourage the management of important interjurisdictional fishery resources. These resources include nearshore fisheries which typically occur in waters under the jurisdiction of one or more states and the Federal government, fisheries resources which migrate between the waters of several states bordering the Great Lakes, or fisheries for which an interstate management plan exists. The IFA replaced the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act (P.L. 88–309), a law criticized for not sufficiently protecting Federal interests in interjurisdictional fisheries. Enactment of the IFA established a new program focusing on national objectives in managing interjurisdictional species throughout their range and promoting state research in support of this management.

Under the Act, grants are made to states for research projects supporting interstate or Federally-managed fisheries. State eligibility criteria and funding apportionment are designed to create incentives for states to engage in interstate fishery management. By encouraging individual states to enter into agreements to promote conservation and management of interjurisdictional species, the Act promotes consistency in Federal fishery management objectives. Additionally, the IFA authorizes the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to assist in funding the Atlantic States, Gulf States, and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commissions in developing interstate fishery management plans.

Finally, the IFA authorizes NMFS to provide emergency grants to states to help mitigate the impacts of commercial fisheries resource disasters. In the past, these funds have been authorized at $2.5 million annually and have been used to assist several mid-Atlantic and Gulf states with shellfish restocking projects.

In 1988 and 1989, $3.8 million was appropriated each year for state grants under the Act, and $330,000 was appropriated annually to support the three interstate Commissions. While $1.8 million was appropriated for disaster relief in 1988, no funds were available in 1989.

Committee Action

On March 1, 1989, Representatives Studds, Jones of North Carolina, and Young of Alaska introduced H.R. 1225, a bill to authorize

appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act through fiscal year 1992. The bill was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and on March 16, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment held a hearing on it. Testimony was received from representatives of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) of the Department of Commerce, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC), the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission (PMFC), and the Sport Fishing Institute (SFI).

The NMFS representative opposed reauthorization of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act, claiming that the programs supported by the Act do not address national priorities. The Commissions representatives, however, maintained that the Act provides for the cooperative management of coastal stocks of significant importance to the Nation. They cited numerous examples of state projects and stressed the importance of continuing Federal support for this program.

On April 12, 1989, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment met to consider H.R. 1225. At that time, Mr. Studds offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1225. The substitute was adopted and the bill, as amended, was reported favorably to the Committee by unanimous voice vote.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries considered H.R. 1225 on April 18, 1989, and ordered the bill, as amended, favorably reported to the House by unanimous voice vote.

Section-by-Section Analysis

Section 1 amends section 304(c)(3)(B) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act to clarify that the enforcement agreements between states and the Secretaries of Commerce or the Interior must pertain to the protection of fishery resources managed under an interstate management plan. This technical change reflects the original intent of the Act.

Section 2 amends section 308(b) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act to require that states contribute 25% to any project funded under the fishery resource disaster provisions of the Act. State contributions may be in the form of in-kind contributions such as personnel costs and ship time.

Section 3 authorizes the appropriation of funds under section 308 of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act for fiscal year 1990, 1991, and 1992.

Cost of Legislation

The provisions of clause 7 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives do not apply where a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Congressional Budget Office has been completed and included in the report.

Inflationary Impact Statement

With respect to the requirements of clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee esti-

mates that the enactment of H.R. 1225 will have no significant impact on inflation or the economy.

Compliance With Clause 2(l)(3) of Rule XI

In compliance with clause 2(l)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) The Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment held a hearing on H.R. 1225 on March 16, 1989.

(b) The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has received no report from the Committee on Government Operations pursuant to clause 4(c)(2) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, of oversight findings and recommendations on the subjects addressed by H.R. 1225.

(c) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office has furnished the Committee with a report fulfilling the requirements of section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and an estimate and comparison of cost of H.R. 1225 pursuant to section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The report reads as follows:

U.S. Congress,
Congressional Budget Office,
Washington, DC, April 24, 1989.

Hon. Walter B. Jones,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for H.R. 1225, a bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992, and for other purposes.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Reischauer.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

1. Bill number: H.R. 1225.

2. Bill title: A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992, and for other purposes.

3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, April 18, 1989.

4. Bill purpose: H.R. 1225 would authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990 through 1992 to the Department of Commerce to carry out the activities of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Authorization level	7.9	7.9	7.9	.....	.....
Estimated outlays	5.3	7.3	7.7	2.5	0.5

The costs of this bill fall within budget function 300.

Basis of estimate: This estimate assumes that the full amounts authorized would be appropriated prior to the beginning of each fiscal year. Outlays are based on historical spending patterns of the program.

6. Estimated cost to State and local Governments: None.

7. Estimate comparison: None.

8. Previous CBO estimate: None.

9. Estimate prepared by: Douglas Criscitello.

10. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nuckols (for James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis).

Departmental Reports

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries received the following report from the Department of Commerce:

General Counsel of the
U.S. Department of Commerce,
Washington, DC, April 5, 1989.

Hon. Walter B. Jones,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine, and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce on H.R. 1225, a bill "To authorize appropriations to carry out the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992."

Enclosed is a copy of the Department of Commerce's testimony for a March 16, 1989, hearing on H.R. 1225 before the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment.

Our testimony states that the Department does not support reauthorization of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Levitt,
Acting General Counsel.

The Committee has also received the following report from the Department of State:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, April 6, 1989.

Hon. WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your request of March 10 for comments on H.R. 1225, a bill to reauthorize the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 through fiscal year 1992.

Since the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act has negligible international implications, the Department of State has no objection to its reauthorization.

Sincerely,

JANET G. MULLINS,
Assistant Secretary,
Legislative Affairs.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as amended, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

16 U.S.C. 4103(c)(3)(B)

(B) has entered into an agreement with the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior under which the personnel, services, and equipment of the State and the Federal agency concerned will be made mutually available for the enforcement of Federal and State laws pertaining to the protection of fishery resources; *which are managed under an interstate fishery management plan*:

---

16 U.S.C. 4107

§ 4107. Authorization of appropriations

(a) GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce for apportionment to carry out the purposes of this chapter $5,000,000 for each of [fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989.] *the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992.*

(b) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the amounts authorized in subsection (a) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce $2,500,000 for each of [fiscal years 1988 and 1989,] *the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992,* which shall be available in such amounts as the Secretary may determine appropriate for the purposes of this chapter, except that—

(1) in providing funds to States under this subsection, the Secretary shall give a preference to those States regarding which the Secretary determines there is a commercial fishery failure of serious disruption affecting future production due to a fishery resource disaster arising from natural or undeter-

mined causes, and any sums made available under this subsection may be used either by the States or directly by the Secretary in cooperation with the States for any purpose that the Secretary determines is appropriate to restore the fishery affected by such a failure or to prevent a similar failure in the future; [and]

(2) the funds authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not be available to the Secretary for use as grants for chartering fishing vessels[.]; *and*

(3) the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with an amount appropriated under the authority of this subsection shall be 75 percent of the cost of that activity.

Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In addition to the amounts authorized under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce $350,000 for each of [fiscal years 1988 and 1989] *the fiscal years 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992* to support the efforts of the following interstate commissions to develop interstate fishery management plans for interjurisdictional fishery resources:

(1) The commission established by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact, as consented to and approved by Public Law 77–539 (56 Stat. 267), approved May 4, 1942.

(2) The commission established by the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact, as consented to and approved by Public Law 80–232 (61 Stat. 419), approved July 24, 1947.

(3) The commission established by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Compact, as consented to and approved by Public Law 81–66 (63 Stat. 70), approved May 19, 1949.

○

101ST CONGRESS
1st Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
101-35

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1990

APRIL 25, 1989.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1763]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1763) to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1990 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 1763 is to authorize expenditures from the Panama Canal Commission Revolving Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal and for any other activities pertinent to the Panama Canal. Only toll monies and other revenues paid by the users of the Panama Canal are authorized to be expended, as well as borrowing authority already authorized by law.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Section 302(c)(2) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3712) specifically requires an authorization of any obligations or expenditures by the Panama Canal Commission (PCC).

In writing the implementing legislation (Public Law 96-70; the "Act") to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 (the Treaty), Congress determined that it was important to retain oversight of the PCC operations through the authorization process.

Congress was primarily interested in a safe and efficient Canal operation and thereby wanted assurance that the funds were

H563-5

wisely and properly spent solely on the operation and maintenance of the Canal. Congress also determined that the Canal should continue to operate on a self-sustaining basis by using tolls and other revenues to operate the Canal rather than taxpayer monies.

A U.S. government agency was established to operate and maintain the Canal and to collect the tolls and revenues which support the Canal operations. Congress would authorize and appropriate the expenditure of these tolls and other revenues.

In 1987, the Act was amended (Public Law 100-203) to convert the PCC account from an appropriated account to a Revolving Fund account. The effect of this change in law was to no longer require an appropriation of tolls and revenues, but to continue to require an authorization of these expenditures. H.R. 1763 is the legislation that authorizes the expenditures of these toll monies and revenues for fiscal year 1990.

COMMITTEE ACTION

On March 16, 1989, the Subcommittee on Panama Canal/Outer Continental Shelf (PC/OCS) held a hearing on the proposed Fiscal Year 1990 budget of the PCC. The witnesses before the Subcommittee were the Honorable William R. Gianelli, Chairman of the Board of the Panama Canal Commission, and the Administrator of the PCC, the Honorable Dennis P. McAuliffe.

Chairman Gianelli commented on the Revolving Fund legislation that was passed by Congress on December 22, 1987 (Public Law 100-203). The Revolving Fund legislation converted the PCC from an appropriated fund agency to a revolving fund agency. Chairman Gianelli stated that the fund conversion could not have come at a more opportune time, considering the budget pressures that will continue to be placed on the U.S. Government budget in the future.

Chairman Gianelli thanked the Members for recognizing the incongruities of maintaining the Commission as an appropriated fund agency. When the PCC operated under the appropriation process, it was subjected to across-the-board budget cuts along with the other government agencies. The unique position of the PCC was that any money not appropriated from the tolls and other revenues would not go into the U.S. Treasury. The reason for this anomaly is that under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1979 any funds not spent in any one fiscal year must be given to Panama; therefore, a reduction in the PCC appropriation would not result in a reduction of the U.S. deficit, but would result in a payment to Panama.

Chairman Gianelli also noted that under the new revolving fund legislation, the basic concepts under which the Panama Canal operates will remain unchanged. The United States Government will continue to maintain full responsibility for the operations of the Canal until December 31, 1999; the Canal continues to operate on a self-sustaining basis at no cost to the U.S. taxpayers; the PCC expenditures and obligations must still be authorized by Congress; and the PCC will continue to be subject to the U.S. Government fiscal and accounting procedures.

The Revolving Fund legislation also required the PCC to transfer $85 million from the PCC fund to the General Fund of the U.S.

Treasury, which represents the unreimbursed balance of the appropriation for Fiscal Year 1980 and which came from the General Fund of the U.S. Treasury. It also required that $62 million of interest money collected on our original investment in the Panama Canal be transferred to the Treasury. The Revolving Fund, therefore, holds no taxpayer monies, and operates solely on revenues of the Canal. In addition, the revolving fund also allows the PCC to borrow up to $100 million from our U.S. Treasury at any one time. The funds would be repaid as revenues are collected. This system allows the Commission to operate the Canal in a more efficient and businesslike manner.

Chairman Gianelli requested a two-year budget of the amount of tolls and revenues collected by the Panama Canal Commission in 1990 and 1991. The Administration has estimated that 1990 operating costs will be approximately $481.3 million. This amount includes payments to Panama totaling $82.1 million. Operating revenues in 1990 are estimated to be $486.2 million, including a toll rate increase that the PCC intended to effectuate (9.1% proposed increase in tolls would generate $31.3 million). Capital outlay projections are $35.5 million in 1989.

Chairman Gianelli further commented on the effect of the political climate in Panama on the operations of the Panama Canal. The Chairman said that the political problems pose serious problems for the efficient operation of the waterway.

The greatest concern to Mr. Gianelli was the morale and well-being of the Canal workforce. The Panamanian employees have had their income tax withholding payments placed into an escrow account by the United States Government. In retaliation for the Republic of Panama not receiving this tax revenue, General Manuel Noriega has ordered these employees' cars to be confiscated and bank accounts frozen. Approximately 6 Panamanian employees have received this treatment thus far.

The U.S. employees, stated Chairman Gianelli, continues to be concerned about the safety of their families. A large increase of burglaries and auto thefts in PCC town sites have been reported.

The PCC Board has also been affected by the political situation in Panama. From January 1988 until the most recent Board meeting on January 11, 1989, the Panamanian Board Members have not attended the meetings. A quorum of five, consisting of the five United States Board Members, was met.

Chairman Gianelli also reminded the Subcommittee Members that on January 1, 1990, the Administrator of the PCC will change from a U.S. to a Panamanian national. The individual nominated by Panama must be appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. The United States will appoint a Deputy Administrator on January 1, 1990.

Administrator McAuliffe reported that the Canal employees, despite the daily stress caused by Panama's political climate, sustained the Canal's operations. Up to $13,000 a day of canal revenues is being spent on transporting workers to the work-site because of General Noriega's harassment campaign. The increased costs to the PCC and the erratic tolls performance will contribute to a minor loss in FY 1989. In FY 1988 the loss was $1.8 million and it is expected to be $2.5 million in FY 1990.

After the hearing and after reviewing the budget request, the Honorable Roy Dyson, Chairman of the Subcommittee on PC/OCS, introduced H.R. 1763, the "Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1990." The legislation was cosponsored by all Members of the Subcommittee including Congressman Lipinski, Congressman Laughlin, Congressman Jack Fields, Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, and Congresswoman Bentley.

H.R. 1763 as introduced was almost identical to the Administration's proposed bill, except that H.R. 1763 authorized one fiscal year, 1990, rather than the two years requested by the Administration.

On April 13, the Subcommittee on PC/OCS reported H.R. 1763 favorably to the Full Committee. There were no amendments and no dissenting views.

On April 18, the Full Committee unanimously, by voice vote, marked up H.R. 1763 without amendment or dissent, and reported it to the House of Representatives.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1

This section states that the Act is cited as the "Panama Canal Commission Act, Fiscal Year 1990."

Section 2

This section authorizes expenditures not to exceed the limits of funds available to the Panama Canal Commission. Funds available to the PCC are derived from tolls and other service fees charged to the users of the Panama Canal and its facilities. Borrowing authority up to $100 million outstanding at any one time is also available to the PCC (Public Law 100-203; 22 USC 3714).

This section also specifically limits official reception expenses to $52,000 and allows for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles without price limitations.

Section 3

This section requires the PCC to give written notification to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate Regarding:

(1) any proposed changes in toll rates for use of the Panama Canal, and

(2) any payments estimated to be due to Panama under paragraph 4(c) of Article XIII of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 (this is the so-called "profit payment" which transfers any unspent money up to $10 million in any one fiscal year to the Republic of Panama), and

(3) any initiation of a capital acquisition or construction project exceeding $10,000,000 that was not specified in the budget estimates submitted to Congress for the fiscal year in which the project would commence.

The Committee finds that a toll increase or a profit payment to Panama are of significant interest to its Members. Because the PCC is allowed to operate on a revolving fund basis, the Committee requires notice of any major (over $10 million) capital project that

was not in the budget reports given to Congress for the PCC's fiscal year authorization request.

Section 4

This section provides for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits determined by law. This is consistent with any COLA increase authorized for other Federal workers.

This section also requires expenditures to conform with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any law implementing the treaties.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2(1)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee estimates that the enactment of H.R. 1763 will have no significant effect on process and costs in the operation of the national economy.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The Committee accepts the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office in this legislation.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 2(l)(3) OF RULE XI

In compliance with clause 2(l)(3) of rule XI of the House of Representatives:

(A) in the consideration of H.R. 1763 the Committee made no new oversight findings and recommendations within the meaning of clause 2(b)(1) of rule X;

(B) the requirements of H.R. 1763 contain no new budget authority or increased tax expenditures reportable under Section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) the Committee on Government Operations has sent no report to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries pursuant to clause (4)(c)(2) of rule X, and;

(D) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under Section 403 of the congressional Budget Act of 1974 is set out below:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 21, 1989.

Hon. WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 1763, the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1990, as ordered by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, April 18, 1989.

H.R. 1763 would authorize the Panama Canal Commission to spend any sums available to it from operating revenues or Treasury borrowing for operation, maintenance, and improvement of the canal in fiscal year 1990. CBO estimates that 1990 collections would be about $500 million if the planned toll increase (about $32 million) becomes effective. Obligations for the year are projected to be

about the same. We expect the Panama Canal Commission revolving fund to have net receipts (i.e., negative outlays) of about $4 million in 1990, under CBO's baseline assumptions.

Enactment of this bill would have no impact on the budgets of state or local governments.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis, who can be reached at 226–2860.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

No departmental reports were received on H.R. 1763.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

There are no changes in existing law, therefore, requirements of clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives are not necessary to apply.

○